EDITORIAL OPINIONS OF THE LEADING JOURNALS UPON CURRENT TOPICS-COMPILED EVERY DAY FOR THE EVENING TELEGRAPH.

Sectional Interest and National Unity. From the N. Y. Times.

The obvious difference between those whose passions impel them to a continued war of opinion and those whose interests require a restoration of the Union spirit throughout the whole country, is too great to be reconciled. Everywhere there are indications that the men who spin cotton cannot be much longer separated from the men who grow cotton, nor can those who sell goods at the counters of New York safely acquiesce in the continued disability of their Southern customers to purchase and pay for their goods. There is the levee question. The measures necessary for the successful prosecution of the war levelled the levees and sent the lawless Mississippi rushing over the whole arable Delta. The policy of General Banks and others has withheld Federal aid as a new term of reconstruction. Now, who does this policy hurt most? The Southern secessionists? They are comparatively few in numbers. They have been so long ruined as to be indurated and callous to further misfortune. Besides, they are the landholders, and from the little that is produced they receive a frugal maintenance. Does the freedman feel this unusual destruction of crop and labor? Undoubtedly. He has nothing except his labor. This he sells for subsistence; but if he knows that all planting and ploughing is in vain where the rains descend and the flood comes to inundate the country for weeks at a time, he can have no more motive to toil than have those tillers around the desert, who look with certainty for an annual visit of the Arabs to carry off the fruit of their labors. A correspondent mentions a conversation with a freedman in an interior parish of Louisiana, in which he gave as a reason for not having hired himself to a planter, that the latter would employ him in repairing fences and buildings, digging ditches, and cut-ting down bushes and briers; that the "water would come," destroy the crop, and with that the planter's only means of repaying the freedman; so he had decided to cut wood for a steamboat landing rather than plant.

The same refusal of relief which punishes

the Rebel with a reduction of income inflicts the same loss upon his loyal neighbor, and deprives the loyal freedman of employment. Nor is this mischief confined to the population of Louisiana. The sugar crop of 1860 was nearly half a million hogsheads. It has declined to twenty or thirty thousand. The price of cane sugar has advanced nearly fourfold. It is now produced almost exclusively by slave labor in Cuba and Brazil. Now note, the effects. The Northwest and the East once paid for the sugar crop of Louisiana in the respective products of their industry. Now they export three-fold the price of that sugar in specie. This is in effect the destruction of a home product to build up a slave-grown product in foreign countries. Fanaticism is thus stronger than the protective principle. The reduction of the cotton crop has had an injurious effect on the home manufacture of cotton goods. England has opened up her vast East Indian possessions. She has increased the crop until the combined supply from countries other than the United States has reached nearly three-fourths of her consumption. The stock on hand in the United States does not now exceed one hundred and fifty thousand bales, while in Liverpool alone it is four times that amount. The price of cotton is thus fixed abroad. The United States has lost its position as a regulator of price, and now takes whatever Liverpool

The restoration of the cotton crop would be much promoted by rebuilding the levees, and yet Congress has forborne to do so lest the restoration of the Union should be thereby postponed. It is not necessary to pursue the effects of these reduced crops upon the shipping interest, which, deprived of outfreights by this cause, has lost its great advantage over the commercial marine of England. The Government collects a tax on cotton by the pound, and an income tax on the sales of the planter. It now receives a tax on one pound where it would formerly have received a tax on three. The subject is too extensive to treat in a cursory manner. All are convinced that Louisiana cannot repair her levees. She has made the effort by offering her bonds at home and abroad. Capitalists will scarcely touch them at has appealed to any discount. She Congress for aid. Possibly the applications have been entrusted to improper hands. But Congress thus far has closed its ears to the interests of the submerged loyalist and freedman, the Northwestern farmer, the Eastern shipowner and cotton-spinner. In the next place, the restoration of the levees is a national matter, for it pertains to the production of national staples and the employment of national interests. It is a humane measure, for if the Government issues rations to the destitute people of the South, and sends its vessels to Ireland to relieve a foreign famine, it may well lend its endorsement to bonds having for their object the employment and maintenance of a whole people suffering from a calamity which the war has rendered it impossible for them to control.

In this connection we may quote from the address of the Police Jury of Concordia Parish, Louisiana, to the Major-General commanding the District. It sets forth the deplorable condition of the whole alluvial country as known to him, the suffering from the devastations of the war, the successive inundations of 1865-'66-'67, the damage done the growing crops by the cotton-worm, and the prospect of a cotton famine. With the destitution of the people comes the utter annihilation of public credit. Says the address:-

"Our parish in its coporate capacity, and our citizens individually, are utterly overwheimed with debt. It has been found impossible for our parochial authorities to provide for the ordinary expenses of administration. Our Legislature has suspended the collection of taxes on overflowed lands, and both the State and parish are without either money or credit, and utterly powerless to make any provision for indigents." Upon whom does this fall? The address

supplies an answer:-

"As a necessary result of this state of facts, most of the freedmen will soon be discharged; in fact, it is not improbable that three-fourths of them will be discharged within two months. We have no certain data to learn the present population of the parish, or the relative propor-tion of the white and colored races. It appears from the books of the Registers for this parish that the total population of coccordia is \$252, of which 960 are white, and 7292 are colored persons. It is impossible for us to approximate with any certainty us to the number who will require aid; this will greatly depend upon their ability to find employment."

How may they be relieved? The Police

Jury remark:-"That at the very time this large class of laborers are likely to be thrown out of employ-ment, the banks of the Mississippi will be in the most suitable condition for the reconstru-tion of the levees, without which our once fer-

forests. We consider it a great public misfortune, and source of extreme regret, that so fortunate an opportunity for their reconstruction should be permitted to pass unimproved, and cannot but hope that the Major-General commanding this district will, through his efforts and influence, devise some means to give direction to this labor in the manner indicated, thereby regulating a present evil into a public thereby resolving a present evil into a public

If Congress will take up this proposition, it will do good to a whole people, without regard to color or condition. If it does not, these freedmen may say:-"You give us the ballot to vote for you, but withhold the bread to subsist ourselves and starving families." The employment and aid solicited would reconcile all to the justice of a Government which, in the hour of triumph, listens to the cry of despair.

General Grant Again!

From the N. Y. Tribune. General Grant is suffering at the hands of bis friends, and from no friend so much as the New York Times. That newspaper charges the Tribune with hypocrisy. Let us see who

is the real hypocrite. The Times, in its Tuesday's issue, used

these words:-"Through many channels it will be asserted that General Grant's compliance with the call indicates his approval of Mr. Stanton's removal, and consequently of the policy which exacts that proceeding. On this head, fortunally, there is no room for misrepresentation. General Grant has not allowed his habitual reticence to leave the country in doubt as to his position on the great occasion of difference between Congress and the Executive. He sup-ports the plan of Congress, and is in favor of its prompt and vigorous enforcement. The Cop-perhead counsellors of Mr. Johnson will derive

o succor from General Grant.' Here is a plain statement. The editor practically says:- "General Grant is a radical." We know it. He supports Congress. We know that. It is a happy thing he does not sup-port President Johnson. We feel very comfortable." No gentleman will make a statement without authority, and no newspaper, especially, will venture to place a public man upon a political platform without reasons for It was very important for us to know that General Grant was a radical. We found all the evidence leading to an opposite conclusion. Supposing that the Times really spoke what it knew, we asked for its authority. The reply is a coarse assault upon the Tribune, and a virtual admission that the statement above quoted is false, and of course printed to deceive. On Tuesday, it said that Grant's acceptance of the office was merely "temporary and formal" -something disagreeable and peremptoryand that the President virtually exchanged the radical Stanton for the radical Grant. Now we are told that Grant assumed the office to prevent the Government from stopping! On Tuesday, Grant entered the Cabinet a radical. On Friday, we are assured he represents the "conservative majority" of Congress. In the meantime, our demand for information is ignored, and the Times, in failing to give us the evidence that General Grant has not allowed his habitual reticence to leave the country in doubt" as to his radical-ism, compels us to doubt and fear that its editor is endeavoring to juggle us now, even as when last year he sought to drag the Repub-lican party into the Philadelphia Copperhead Convention under a pretense that the conven-

tion was to reform and strengthen the party! Those who charge us with assailing Grant entirely misapprehend our position. We are not conscious of having ever, in the slightest degree, done him injustice. The question is one of fact. What is his position? He is named as a radical candidate for the Presidency. Is he a radical? If he is, let it be made apparent. If he is not a radical, very well. In that case we shall not vote for him, although we may respect him none the less. There is no soldier, for instance, we honor more than General Sherman. We should crown him with laurels, and write his name on a hundred monuments. But we do not think we should vote for him as President of the United States, because he is an avowed believer in the policy of Andrew Johnson. It is an honest difference of opinion, nothing more. General Sherman would make a sincere President. He would do what he deemed to be best. But his policy would not be ours; his counsellors would, probably, be men we did not trust, and his administration would sustain principles which we deem pernicious. It is because General Sherman is so regarded that his name is not mentioned by some of our friends as a candidate. They honor him: but unless he accepts their platform they will not vote for him. Now, is Grant not in pre-

cisely the same position? We ask for infor-

mation. People tell us with wise mutterings that Grant is sagacious; that he bides his time; that the politicians will not trap him; that he will run uncommitted; that if he takes the Presidential office he will do as he deems best, and rise above party. Probably General Grant can afford to be a deaf-and-dumb candidate, but the country cannot afford to elect a deaf-and-dumb President. If these were ordinary times of peace, and the Executive office meant the appointment of tide-waiters, postmasters, and consuls, we might be content to see Grant in the office, even if he never had an opinion. If the country were in the condition it was when Johnson was elected, we might say-"Take Grant; he is available; we shall have an easy, pleasant canvass, and no bother." But we are now confronted with a problem more serious than any before known in our country. It is a problem that will not permit of conservatism or compromise. It must be radically treated, and we must have a man whose soul burns with the work. A timid, hesitating, unsympathetic President would bring disaster, especially if his policy were masked by the dazzling and seductive splendor of military fame. If all our Generals were silent, it none of them had opinions, if the silence and uncertainty that rests like a pall over the name of Grant were common to these warriors, we might even then consider his candidacy unavoidable. But the truth is, Grant is among the few Generals who have not spoken. We know where Sheridan stands. We know what Thomas thinks. We have heard Sickles and Pope speak. We are sure of Butler and Logan. We have no fear of these men. They are not uniformed Sphynxes -sashed and girded statues. If it is nacessary that a General should settle reconstruction, we can easily find one.

The Republican party is too great; its missien is too mighty; to speak politically, it is too strong—with three-fourths of the next electoral college almost inevitably in its hands to go begging for a candidate, or to intrust its work to a man who does not feel in sympathy with it. If General Grant is the man, we shall be happy. But in the face of his recent record, in the face of his silence, in the face of the appalling fact that the men who claim to speak for him are the men who planned the great Copperhead Convention in Philadelphia, we are anxious and doubting. Great as Grant is, he cannot carry our banner unless he wears our uniform. He cannot lead this party unless we know where he means to When he commanded our armies, every soldier knew who he meant to fight. It is

to begin even a greater canvass. Is it too a very fair prospect of anticipating in October much for us to ask, before we fall in line, the inevitable November reaction in New York. what colors are we to wear, and who are our

The Golden Rule-"Poetic Justice." From the N. Y. Evening Express.

We have no idea that any supporter of the Rump Congress, any Republican, or any Northern or Western man, would willingly place himself and his interests under a government of negroes -and of negroes, moreover, who have scarcely acquired the habits or restraints of civilization, and in some cases, still cling to fetish worship of their native Africa. To be forced into so unuatural and revolting a political connection, they would be very apt to consider a grievous hardship, which only the most implacable foes, not friends, could impose upon them.

Now, what we could never be reconciled to curselves, we are enforcing upon our own race, our own brethren, in ten States of the Union Pluming ourselves upon our Christianity, it suits us in this matter to set entirely at naught the golden rule of doing unto others as we would that others, under similar circumstances, should do unto us. We do not know whether the great masses of our people ever take that idea into their heads or not; but of

the fact itself there can be no gainsaying. The party by and through whose instrumentality this work is now in process of ac complishment, ostentatiously professes to be the exponent of "great moral ideas." Yet i boldly and persistently ignores that funda-mental principle of the moral law which enjoins one to love his neighbor as himself. This may be good radical policy, but it is bad

Christianity. It cannot be pleaded in justification of this stupendous wrong to our race, that negro en-franchisement is but a temporary measure, to be abandoned when the white "rebels" become more attached to the Union. A class once invested with suffrage can never be deprived of it. That proposition may as well be accepted at once as an invariable truth and an unalterable fact. Hence the perilous experiment the radicals are now making in the late slave States is to be attended by enduring effects. As the experiment itself cannot be reversed, but must go forward from development to de velopment, so its influences, whatever they are to be, must be borne.

We repeat, that under the existing radical machinery established in Louisiana, the white man is placed politically at the mercy of the We have a statistical demonstration of the fact in the returns of the registry lists, now for the first time officially published. Here are the figures:-

LOUISIANA. Black majority NORTH CAROLINA.

As in Louisiana, so we presume it will be in all the other States. The so-called registry in the formerly good old conservative Whig State of North Carolina has just begun-and the complexion of that beginning, as seen below, is a foreshadowing of the general re-

Blacks Black majority.. SOUTH CAROLINA.

In Charleston, S. C., the registry commenced on Monday last-and thus far, we have the following returns:-

It may gratify the vindictiveness of a "party of great moral ideas" to witness this thorough subversion of the civilized Anglo-American to the semi-barbarous African; but vindictiveness ever brings with it, sooner or later, and in some form or other, its own punishment, and in this case, part of the punishment will be the presence of this new, semi-barbaric element in the halls of legislation (Federal and State), to help make laws for us of the North and West, as well as for the South. This is what the philosophers would call "poetic justice." It may not come at once, it may not come for a few years yet, but the radical policy has set the machinery in motion which must, sooner or later, whether we like it or not, be productive of that very

The Coming State Elections. From the N. Y. Herald.

The great national issue which will overshadow all others in our coming fall elections in the Northern States will be the issue of negro supremacy hereafter in our national affairs, through a Southern negro political balance of power, contemplated and broadly foreshaddowed in the Congressional programme of Southern reconstruction. The Republican party, from Abraham Lincoln's election to the Presidency down to this scheme of a transfer of political power in the South from the white to the black race, has been sustained by the almost unbroken voice of the Northern States in all its measures; first, for the suppression of the Rebellion, and next, for the reorganization of the Rebel States on the basis of universal liberty. But in this bold and dangerous scheme of putting the Southern political balance of power over our national affairs in the hands of the blacks, just released from the darkness and demoralization of negro slavery, it strikes us that only in another form the Republicans are making the same fatal mistake which was made by the late national Democracy when they attempted to perpetuate the reign of the Southern slaveholding oligarchy, with their laws, decrees, and dogmas for the perpetuation and extension of slavery itself.

This is but the swinging of the pendulum from one extreme to the other-it is steering from Seylla to Charybdis. What peace or harmony can we hope for in exchanging the insolent rule of the late three hundred thousaud Southern slaveholders for the rule of five hundred thousand Southern negroes, who but yesterday were slaves, and the descendants of ignorant slaves for hundreds of years? The experiment involves an outrage upon the enlightened public opinion of the Northern States, which will surely meet with a decisive

rebuke. We cannot doubt that this desperate experi ment of negro supremacy will be emphatically condemned by the voice of New York in our coming November election. A change of eight or ten thousand votes in the six hundred and add thousands of this great Commonwealth is but a bagatelle; but it will suffice to revolutionize the State. Upon this broad and distinct question of negro supremacy, however, we may look for a change of thirty, forty, or fifty thousand, as compared with the figures of our last November election. In Ohio, with Vallan digham and his obnoxious Copperhead notions again in the foreground, there is but a gloomy prospect for the opposition elements. They cannot be combined on Vallandigham or under

The substantial yeomanry of Pennsylvania, who could not follow Buchanan in 1860, in behalf of Breckinridge and the Southern slaveholding ollgarchy, will not be apt to follow "Old Thad Stevens" in 1867, in behalf of Southern negro supremacy.

No political party, however strong it may have grown in the confidence of the people, or however confident it may be in its strength and resources, can betray the public confidence or outrage public opinion with impunity. The penalty speedily follows the offense. Our po-litical history abounds in such warnings. Take, for example, the nomination of a candi date for Governor in this State through certain party arrangements with a notorious gambler, and mark the result, notwithstanding the unpopularity of the opposing candidate on local issues. On the other hand, we find the late dominant party in Connecticut reduced to a minority in presuming to bring forward a humbugging showman as a representative of their principles and their morality. How, then can the Republican party expect to escape the consequences of its bad faith with the people, when the people come to pronounce their judgment upon this presumptuous and dangerous scheme of negro supremacy?

This is the question now awaiting the popular judgment:-Shall the ten excluded Southern Rebel States be reorganized and restored to Congress, each and all under a predominant negro vote from the disfranchisement and disgust of white men, or shall Congress itself be called upon by the people of the North to pause, reconsider and reconstruct its terms of reconstruction so as to give the Southern whites a chance, at least where they constitute a heavy majority of the people, as, for instance, in Virginia, North Carolina, or Georgia? Upon this question we expect a political reaction in the North this fall which will enforce some attention and respect from Congress. It is to the people that we look for a rescue; for while the laws stand as they are, President Johnson can do very little to stay their operation, however great the number of removals and changes he may make. We look to the people for a reaction against this perillous scheme of fastening upon the country a controlling negro political balance of

Personal Representation.

From the N. Y. Nation.

The growing feeling in favor of the representation of minorities, both here and in England, is one of the many proofs that, however attached people may be to the principle of democracy, they are not yet satisfied that they have hit on the best mode of applying it.

The people, even of New York city, really want a good government; they really want good men in office; if they did not, we should be ready this moment for Mr. Cushing's "man on horseback." But they have no power to secure a good government and good men in office, because they possess no adequate control over the nominations made by party leaders. A nomination once made is a finality; fit or unfit, it must be sustained at the peril of the odium of "treason to the party," or the more real and serious responsibility of "giving aid to the enemy." Once overthrow the oligarchy of wire-pullers, make it possible in some way for the people to withhold their approval when incompetent or dishonest men are put into nomination, and other political reforms would speedily follow.

It would appear, at first sight, that a power which, like that under discussion, is exercised by wholly irresponsible private citizens, is of a so purely moral nature that it cannot be reached by legislation, but must be left to the good sense of the people to deal with. But this is precisely what we have been doing now for many years, and with only the result of seeing party despotism grow stronger and stronger. And the reason is that our political organization, being based entirely upon local districts, and multiplying to excess the number of officials chosen by popular vote, affords every facility for the manipulations of wirepullers. If it is possible, either by statute or constitutional provision, to remove these peculiar opportunities and temptations, the evil will, in a great measure, come to an end of itself. It is not desired to interfere in any way with the legitimate action of party organizations. These are an indispensable instrumentality in enabling like-minded men to combine their scattered forces and bring them to bear upon definite objects-thus converting latent power into active power. But what we do need is to give individual opinion a chance to make itself felt upon these organizations, and render it possible to "scratch" a bad nomination without practically voting for the opposite candi-

Mr. Hare's plan of personal representation, to which attention has been so widely directed of late years, promises to accomplish this object; and we wish to suggest what seems to be a feasible way of adapting the leading principle of his plan to our American community and institutions. It is certain that, in the form in which he has developed it, it is so complicated and tedious that, whether intrinsically good or bad, it never could obtain approval or even serious consideration among our people. Whether the fact is to our credit or not, we may make up our minds at the start that no plan has any chance of adoption among us which is not easily and readily understood, and which does not provide for ascertaining the result of an election as early as the day after it takes place.

The undue stress laid, as well by Mr. Hare himself as by all who have advocated his plan, upon unessential details, which concern merely the method of putting it in practice, has had the effect of drawing the attention away from the essential principle of his scheme. The essential and fundamental principle is simply this-that it is the people who are represented, and not the place, and that, therefore, constituencies should be personal, and not local. According to this plan, if a citizen of Syracuse wished to vote for Horace Greeley for Congress, or a citizen of Brooklyn for Millard Fillmore, he would have the right to do so; his vote for this candidate would count for him with those cast in every other section of the State; and the constituency of the successful candidate would be those who voted for him, wherever they happened to

This is the simple and philosophical feature of Mr. Hare's plan, which has obtained the unqualified commendation of Mr. Mill and other thinkers; the rest of his scheme consists of devices for obtaining an absolutely equal representation of a community upon this general plan - devices adapted, perhaps, to the English people, but so utterly foreign to the character and habits of our people that they may be passed over without description. It is very certain that a community which has almost universally adopted the principle of plurality in elections, for the sake of the speedy result, will not enter into an elaborate alculation of quotas, and potter over the "distribution of the surplus," in order that the canvassing of votes may be theoretically fair and every minority exactly represented. tion of the levees, without which our once for-tile fields will soon relapse to their primitive | proposed to give him a higher command, and | Vallandigham. But in Pennsylvania they have | What our people want is a legislature repreVill Live Whiskies.

THE LARGEST AND BEST STOCK OF

FINE OLD RYE WHISKIES

IN THE LAND IS NOW POSSESSED BY

HENRY S. HANNIS & CO.,

Nos. 218 and 220 SOUTH FRONT STREET, WHO OFFER THE SAME TO THE TRADE IN LOTS ON VEHY ADVANTAGEOUS TESTAL PERS.

Their Stock of Rye Whishles, IN BURD, comprises all the favorite brands extent, and rups through the various months of 1865,'66, and of this year, up to present date.

Liberal contracts made for lots to arrive at Pennsylvania Railroad Depot, Erricsson Line Wharf, or at Bonded Warehouses, as parties may elect.

Indeed, Mr. Hare himself contesses, in his last (third) edition, that "a perfect uniformity in the number of the quota of votes for every member" is "really important." This surenders the whole point at issue.

If the proposition went no further than this, every man throughout the State voted for is favorite candidate without regard to his place of residence, and the required number at the head of the list were declared elected, there would probably not be much more inequality than at present. A great disparity would, of course, exist between the number of votes received by the first on the list and the thirty first; but so there is now between Mr. Ward's 17,000 votes and Mr. Morrissey' 9000. An enormous vote for any candidate would, under this system, be only a natural and, to a certain extent, proper tribute to his popularity. Still it would, no doubt, be wise to establish a definite quota which every successful candidate must obtain, as a security against the accident of persons elected by a mere handful of votes. Supposing the principle once adopted, the

details would be very easy to arrange. The most difficult point to decide would probably be the filling of vacancies, whether occurring by death or resignation, or by the failure of a sufficient number to obtain the quota. It would seem that in these cases the best way would be to let the legislature fill the vacancy. taking as candidates the two or three highest names left upon the list. Party organizations would find a legitimate and very useful sphere of action in assigning candidates to the voters of different localities, and thus preventing votes from being thrown away. It would be easy to calculate the number of members which each party in the State would probably be able to elect, and divide the State roughly into districts for these various candidates, taking due account of the natural and healthy local feeling. Most persons would, as a matter of course, vote for the candidate thus assigned, provided he were personally acceptable; but it would no longer be possible, as it is now, to force an unfit candidate upon an unwilling constituency. Such a candidate would be so sure to run behind his ticket, and fail of an election, that the committees would find it their only safe way to put up their best men.

Another way of preventing the loss of votes would be by letting the election continue ten days, as in England. This was suggested by Mr. J. T. Fisher, of Philadelphia, who propose a plan for personal representation, independent of Mr. Hare, without Mr. Hare's favorite feature of endorsing a second choice upon the ballot, and distributing the surplus votes. At the end of the first day it would be ascertained that certain candidates were surely elected, and certain others in doubt, and the voters of the second day would east their votes where they seemed most needed. Mr. Fisher's other proposition for meeting the same difficulty, by allowing successful candidates to assign their surplus to other candidates who fell short, can hardly be considered practicable or desirable. By the adoption of this principle we should secure the chief advantage which the English system possesses, of allowing the choice of non-resident representatives, and thus remove one of the greatest hindrances to the development of a superior of public men. A member would no longer be afraid to offend local prejudices or go against the opinions of his district, and a man of weight and character might be reasonably sure of always finding a constituency to support him, scattered through the State, but able to unite upon their man, and make every vote count for him. Thus local feeling could still be gratified, but without depriving the State of the services of a valuable servant, as is now often

It has seemed most natural to speak of members of Congress, as these are the most important and prominent representatives elected by the people. The system can, how-ever, be easily applied to any representative body or board of commissioners of sufficient importance to interest the mass of the people as the Legislature of the State or the Common Council of the city. A Board of Aldermen, composed of a very small number, as pro-posed in the *Nation* of May 30, would be espe-cially adapted to this mode of election. It may be remarked that, for a legislative body within the limits of a State or city, it might not be necessary to have any fixed number. There is no peculiar virtue in the number 120

or 240. It cannot be expected, nor should it be desired, that so fundamental a reform as that proposed should be introduced at once upon a arge scale solely in virtue of its apparent theoretical advantages. It seems as if an election held in this way could not fail to give us a vastly superior body of legislators to the present, while every portion of the commumity would be fairly represented. The Republicans of New York city, and the Democrats of the western counties, would now have their rightful share of power. No minority, indeed, not too small to be relatively insignificant, would need to be unrepresented, and no man of power would need to search for a constituency.

Minority Representation in England. From the N. Y. World.

We are in an epoch of marvels. That a more thorough Reform bill than was ever contemplated by the Liberals should have been originated and passed by a Tory administration, is wonderful enough; but even this is outdone by the origin in that citadel of Toryism-the House of Lords-of a measure so progressive as the representation of minorities in Parliament. But the wender ceases, in both cases, when we come to understand the motives. In bringing forward the new Reform bill, Lord Derby's administration have acted as our own Southern statesmen might have done, had

they recognized the inevitable doom of sla-

very, alolished it themselves, enfranchised

the negroes, and claimed the credit and grati-

tude due from the emancipated race. In poli-

senting them fairly in the main, and composed of honest and able men; and whatever plan will secure this result is so far a salutary reform, even if not theoretically perfect. this difference, and have put themselves in a fair way to guide the animal instead of being gored by him. The introduction into the Reform bill of the principle of minority representation is also a concession to progressive tendencies made in the hope of its profiting the aristocracy. The new Reform bill puts property and intelligence in the minority, and so the Lords evince great alacrity in adopting a principle which enables the minority to elec: some members of Parliament.

Some American newspapers speak of Lord Cairns' successful amendment as if it embodied the principle of cumulative voting. This is erroneous. Lord Cairns' speech introducing the amendment should have saved everybody from this mistake, for he in one passage contrasts his proposal with the cumulative vote. The essence of the cumulative scheme is, that an elector may give more than one vote for one person; as, for example, when three mem-bers are to be elected, the elector may, if he chooses, instead of giving one vote to each of three candidates, give three votes to one. It is from this concentration or accumulation upon one candidate of votes by the same elector that the scheme takes its name of cumulative voting. Lord Cairns' amendment to the Reform bill is of quite a different complexion. By it, the privileges of the individual voter are not enlarged, but abridged. Instead of enabling an elector to give his three votes to one candidate, it merely takes one of his three votes away. It does this, and does nothing else. The two votes that remain to him must be given to separate candidates, the same as his three votes would have been if Lord Cairns' amendment had not deprived him of one of

The ostensible object, or pretext, of Lord Cairns in proposing this amendment was not so much the representation of minorities as the equalization of political power among the several constituencies. The greater part of the constituencies send only two members: but there will be eleven constituencies which will send three members each. As a voter in one of these last would have a share in three members of Parliament, while in an ordinary constituency he has a share in only two, Lord Cairns artfully proposed to reduce the inequality, by allowing each elector in what he called the "three-cornered constituencies" to vote for only two members, the same as the others. Putting the amendment on this ground may not have been disingenuous, but it was certainly dexterous, as tending to conceal the real purpose which was to recover to the aristocracy by the amendment a part of what it loses by the bill. The bill makes the "wages class" predominant in all the great centres of industry. The amendment takes away one of the three members they would otherwise elect, and makes restitution of him to the higher classes. It is not meant as a step forward to a more advanced liberalism, but a step backward from the concessions made in the Reform bill. This is the reason why the Lords so promptly supported it; and this, perhaps, explains why the Government opposed it. The Government, which intends to make political capital out of the Reform bill, could not afford to incur the imputation of wishing to back out of a part of it.

In the so-called three-cornered constituencies, the majority will elect only two of the three members, and a minerity will have a chance of electing the third. If the system is found to work well, the number of threemembered constituencies will probably be largely increased. Thus a great reform bids fair to get a handsome start by the reactionary tendencies of an ancient aristocracy. It will not be the first time in the history of human affairs that men have "builded wiser than they knew."

The success of minority representation in England will more and more draw attention to the necessity of its introduction, in some shape, into the United States. We believe that a good working plan is yet to be devised; but of the fairness of allowing minorities to be represented in proportion to their numbers, there can be no reasonable question. It must be productive of advantages much greater and more solid than satisfying the sense of fair play. It will introduce into our legislative bodies two classes of men, now generally excluded, whose influence will be most salutary. One of these classes will consist of cool, proud men of great personal independence, who scorn to play the demagogue by falling in with the popular delusions of the hour. Such men could, of course, be out-voted; but, supposing them to be right, they could not easily be out-argued. Their intrepidity and clearness of head would have a restraining influence at times when the majority were most prone to run wild temporary flush of passion. Another and still more valuable class who would be brought into the Legislature by the representation of minorities, are men in advance of their time, and therefore condemned by the majority. The great improvements by which society is carried forward gather disciples but slowly. The adoption of such improvements would be accelerated by giving their advocates an opportunity to explain and defend them on a stage where they would command public attention. The ordeal of thorough debate against well-equipped autagonists would explode pseudo reforms, and advance real ones. We can see nothing but good in minority representation, if some system can be found by which it can be made to work.

FIRE AND BURGLAR PROOF SAFES

C. L. MAISER.

MANUFACTURES OF FIRE AND BURGLAR-PROOF BAFES. LOCKSMITH, BELL-HARGER, AND

PEALER IN BUILDING HARDWARE, NO. 424 BACE STREET. A LARGE ASSORTMENT OF PIRE doors, Dweiling-house Safes, free from dampuess.

Prices low.

6.5 No. 62 VINE Street.

south the analysis for the effection